

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERGE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
10/031,086	01/16/2002	Geoffry James Wolfe Taylor	017264-0113	017264-0113 6084		
22428	7590 10/05/2004		EXAM	EXAMINER		
FOLEY AND LARDNER SUITE 500			BRAHAN, 1	BRAHAN, THOMAS J		
3000 K STREET NW			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
WASHINGTON, DC 20007			3652	<del>-</del>		

DATE MAILED: 10/05/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Advisory Action	10/031,086	TAYLOR ET AL.	4)
A managery results	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Thomas J. Brahan	3652	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	pears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 13 September 2004 FAILS TO PL Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of App Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	avoid abandonment of this application (1) a timely filed amendment whi	cation. A proper report can place the application of the capplication of the capplicat	oly to a cation in
PERIOD FOR R	EPLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) $\square$ The period for reply expires $\underline{3}$ months from the mailing date	-		
<ul> <li>b)</li></ul>	than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date o	f the final rejection.	
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The chave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortent (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three nearned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ension and the corresponding amount of the ed statutory period for reply originally set in	e fee. The appropriate ex the final Office action; or	tension fee under (2) as set forth in
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellan 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 C			
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered	because:		
(a) they raise new issues that would require furt	her consideration and/or search	(see NOTE below);	
(b)  they raise the issue of new matter (see Note	below);		
<ul><li>(c)  they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or</li></ul>	n in better form for appeal by ma	erially reducing or s	simplifying the
(d)  they present additional claims without canc	eling a corresponding number of	finally rejected clair	ms.
NOTE:			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejo	ection(s):		
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) wou canceling the non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>	d be allowable if submitted in a s	separate, timely file	d amendment
5.⊠ The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request application in condition for allowance because:		sidered but does NO	OT place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered b raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ecause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which we	ere newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendme explanation of how the new or amended claims			and an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follow	s:		

Thomas J. Brahan Primary Examiner Art Unit: 3652

10. Other: \_\_\_\_

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_. Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_. Claim(s) rejected: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

8. The drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_ is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner.

9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s).

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the broad teachings of a screen at an outlet is not sufficient for the claims to recite the specific location of the screen as to divide the receptacle into upper and lower sections. Applicant's argument that the open top container of Taylor would not empty when tilted, as shown in figure 3, is not understood, unless the reference has a restricted opening that is not evident from the drawings.